DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 954 JC 820 333

AUTHOR Clark, D. Joseph; Redmond, Mark V.
TITLE Small Group Instructional Diagnosis: Final Report.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Dept. of Biology Education.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 21p.; Appendices mentioned in the report are not included.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Course Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; *Instructional Improvement; Postsecondary Education; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Student Reaction; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Small Group Instructional Diagnosis

ABSTRACT

A procedure for student evaluation and feedback on faculty instruction was developed at the University of Washington. The system involved the use of faculty members as facilitators in conducting Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID) to generate student feedback to instructors about the courses' strengths, areas needing improvement, and suggestions for bringing about these improvements. The SGID procedure involves a number of steps: contact between the facilitator and instructor; classroom intervention to ascertain student opinions; a feedback session between facilitator and instructor; instructor review of the SGID with the class; and a follow-up session between the facilitator and instructor. Following the development of the SGID process, handouts and videotapes were produced to explain the procedure and the SGID technique was demonstrated in over 130 classes and at a number of faculty workshops. Students' responses to the technique were favorable, indicating that it was a better means of obtaining feedback than other evaluation methods. During the second year of testing, a study comparing student motivation of SGID participants and a control group showed significant improvement in motivation on 10 of 18 variables for SGID participants and none for the non-SGID group. Evaluations by workshop coordinators and instructors also indicated an overall positive response, and an external evaluation suggested that the technique may become a major mode of facilitating instructional improvement. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mark V. Redmond
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED217954

FINAL REPORT

SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTIONAL DIAGNOSIS

University of Washington/Biology Education Department
Seattle, Washington
D. Joseph Clark/ Mark V. Redmond
(206) 543-6588

A. Project Overview

Most conventional paper/pencil, end-of-term questionnaire course evaluation techniques fail to have much impact on course improvement. The information that is generated by student questionnaires has come to be used primarily by administrators who seek some easy numerical indice of "teaching effectiveness."

Alternatively, a system was initiated by D. Joseph Clark at the University of Washington's Biology Learning Resource Center to use faculty members as facilitators for conducting Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID). SGID generates feedback from midterm small group discussion among students about a course. Students offer suggestions to solving problems in instruction for the instructor's consideration. The technique is designed for instructional improvement rather than administrative evaluation.

In order to introduce SGID as a viable alternative to other evaluation techniques, a two-year grant totalling $90,210 was contracted from FIPSE. This grant has resulted in the demonstration of the technique in over one hundred and thirty university and college classes. Thirty-six formal workshops were conducted on campuses throughout the country. SGID has undergone modification and refinement as a result of the variety of situations in which it has been used. Research conducted under the grant has shown the technique significantly improves student motivation.

Over twenty instititions either have established or will have established formal structures for providing SGID for their faculty by the fall of 1981 with several others expected.

JC 820 333

The seed has now been planted and only time will tell how large the SGID tree will grow. We are aware of institutions which we have visited already sharing the technique with their regional neighbors. It is hoped that, in this way, SGID will continue to take hold and the result will be an increased focus on improving instruction. We are excited by the progress that has been made under the FIPSE grant.

B. Purpose

The following is a statement of how we envisioned the problems of course evaluation in the grant proposal:

> A multitude of changes in American higher education are directing attention towards effective means of evaluating instruction. There has been a demographic shift in the student population from traditional full-time students to older and part-time students, both who have had a variety of background experiences. This trend is expected to continue through the 1980s. At the same time, financial resources in higher education are under pressure from inflation and increased educational costs. The end of expansion of programs has led to decreased mobility of faculty and a higher proportion of tenured faculty on many campuses. Consequently, faculties are experiencing new demands at a time when finances are dwindling and the proportion of new faculty is considerably reduced. One approach to a better utilization of existing resources is through the retraining of faculty to provide additional teaching skills and instructional strategies.
>
> Prerequisite to the improvement of teaching is the development of inexpensive and practical methods of diagnostic assessment. Computer-scored evaluation forms have become standard on many campuses. A major difficulty with their use in teaching improvement is that they generally lack the specificity needed to identify particular deficiencies and so are little help in skills development. A very effective approach to instructional improvement is a systematic program in which a consultant works with faculty on in-depth evaluation of instruction and helps plan changes. However, a disadvantage of this approach is its low cost-effectiveness. Classroom observations, student interviews, and other formats require a considerable time committment from the consultant, and, consequently, the number of faculty with whom a particular consultant can work is limited.

The above statement still holds true, but our project uncovered even more significant problems. First, instructors were either unable or uninclined to use the information gathered from end-of-term questionnaire evaluation

techniques. Second, the students held paper and pencil questionnaires in disregard. Their inputs were providing no immediate impact on the courses they were taking. The students didn't really get a chance to voice opinions on which issues were most critical to them -- no real chance to explain, discuss or analyze. There was no opportunity for them to evaluate the instructor's response to the feedback they generated. Finally, in those few instances where instructors were making efforts to gain student feedback during the course, there was no formal procedure that produced representative sampling of the students.

The above problems were leading to a general disregard by students and faculty for all evaluation procedures. Indeed, the very word "evaluation" connotes a judgment of goodness or badness. We learned to not call SGID evaluation but rather to label it a feedback process.

C. Background

The Biology Learning Resource Center (BLRC) at the University of Washington has been supporting instructional development since 1974. In the summer of 1977, the BLRC began a structured system of intervention following the clinic model developed at the University of Massachusetts by Michael Melnik and Dwight Allen (see "A Handbook for Faculty Development," Vol. 2, by W.H. Bergquist and S.R. Phillips, The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Washington D.C., 1977). The clinic model follows a logical sequence of individual consultation tied to several data collection procedures. One of the procedures involves gathering feedback from students through the use of questionnaires and interviews. As outlined in the Purpose section, there are several problems involved in the use of questionnaires. Interviews are an effective way of gaining

personal input but require a great deal of time and often provide as many diverse perspectives as there are students. The overall approach of Melnik and Allen that involves an outside consultant working with an instructor and processing student-generated feedback seemed very sound.

An alternative method of gaining student feedback using small group discussion was substituted for the questionnaires and interviews. Small Group Instructional Diagnosis was initially introduced in six large courses. In five, SGID was administered at midterm, and at the end of the term, in the sixth. SGID was also used for final evaluation by two instructors outside the BLRC, one here at the University of Washington and one at the University of Nebraska. In addition, SGID was used in evaluating three workshop/conferences for instructors. These included an orientation for teaching assistants at the University of Washington, a workshop at the 1978 Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education Conference, and a regional faculty development conference held at the University of Washington.

In each case where the method was used, it was well received by the majority of participants and considered a success by the facilitator. In one instance where a written response to the method was collected, forty-nine of the fifty students thought the experience was useful. In another course of fifty-two students, it was rated as the most important of the five different means of obtaining feedback that had been used.

The University of Washington, which served as the initial base for testing and developing SGID, has an enrollment of over 37,000 students with a full-time teaching faculty of over 2,500. The University of Washington has used end-of-term questionnaire evaluations longer than any

school in the country. The Educational Assessment Center conducts evaluations in some 5,700 classes each year. Questionnaire evaluations can be considered fairly institutionalized here. There has been strong concern among the University's students and faculty over the problems and limitations of questionnaires discussed earlier. Generally, evaluation was developing a bad reputation, and both faculty and students were becoming apathetic to the process.

The University of Washington can be considered a research institute. Strong emphasis has been placed on faculty research and scholarship. Each year the University brings in approximately $165 million in grants and contracts. This research emphasis sometimes overshadows teaching. Research and resulting publications are much easier to identify and quantify than effective teaching, and thus the reward system tends to rest more upon research accomplishments. There does exist a case of highly motivated and effective instructors who recognize the need to improve teaching. The Faculty Instruction and Development Board is an active advisory unit to the Provost.

D. Project Description

This section will be divided into three parts. First will be a description of the technique in its present form, with a discussion of modifications resulting from experience under the grant. This first section will also explain the rationale underlying various recommendations of how to conduct the technique. The second section will describe the dissemination process which took place including demonstrations, workshops and the development of materials. The third section discusses the research projects conducted over the two years, as well as publications and papers about the research and the technique.

SGID Description

Step One: Small Group Instructional Diagnosis has five basic steps. The first step is an initial conference between the instructor and the facilitator. In this step, the facilitator should: 1) establish a trusting relationship that will serve as a base for further interaction; 2) familiarize the facilitator with the course and the instructor's style; 3) familiarize the instructor with the technique; 4) identify particular areas which are of concern to the instructor; and 5) arrange the place, time and date near or before midterm for the classroom intervention. The timing of SGID was of particular interest under the grant. Obviously, the students can only judge the impact of their suggestions if there is sufficient time to implement their suggestions. Ample time must be given, however, for the students to have made some observations about the course and the instructor.

Step Two: The second step, the actual classroom intervention, involves the following sequence of events. First, it is best that the instructor introduce the facilitator, indicating the instructor's desire to receive honest student feedback, as well as indicating confidence in the facilitator. This helps to give the facilitator immediate credibility. Most schools use a fifty-minute class period. The technique has undergone alot of streamlining to find the proper balance between minimized time consumption and maximum output and effect. Generally, the technique can be conducted in twenty-five minutes, thus leaving the instructor at least half the period for teaching. The technique has been used during both the first and second halves of the period. Conducting the technique during the first half allows for more flexibility of time; thus if necessary 30 or 40 minutes would be available. This does necessitate having an instructor

having to return twenty-five minutes later and perhaps wait in the hall. It also tends to sensitize the students to instructor weaknesses which they will over attend upon the instructor's return, without the instructor realizing why there is snickering. Conducting the technique during the latter half of a period has proven more successful. The facilitator can observe the instructor teaching for 25 minutes and gain a better perspective on the course and the forthcoming student comments. The students have some immediate teaching on which to react. The major problem of latter-half application is running out of time if more than 25 minutes are needed, or if the instructor failed to turn the class over to the facilitator at the end of 25 minutes. To safeguard against these problems, instructors were asked to turn the class over to the facilitator after 20 minutes.

After the introduction by the instructor, the instructor leaves and the facilitator explains the reason for his or her presence. We were frequently asked by students what was going to happen to the information generated. Students were often suspicious of the facilitator -- fearing the facilitator was a henchman for administration. The facilitator should emphasize that the information generated is confidential and will be given only to the instructor. Emphasizing that the students had an opportunity to directly effect the remainder of their course proved to enhance student involvement in the process.

The facilitator then briefly describes the steps the students are to follow. The students will be asked to form groups of four, five, or six, preferably with students they don't know. Previous research show that groups of around five provide an optimal balance between output and member satisfaction. Having students grouped with non-acquaintances reduces socialization time and enhances the task orientation of the group. The

groups are to choose a spokesperson to keep notes on what the group generates. Selecting the spokesperson reduces time that might be spent on task structuring and orientating that occurs in leaderless groups. In the majority of our observations, the spokespersons selected are effective at getting the group members involved, at determining consensus, and moving along the discussion.

The facilitator explains that they are to address three questions. For each question, they should generate a list of responses about which they generally all agree. The three questions are:

1) What do you like about the course?

2) What do you think needs improvement?

3) What suggestions do you have for bringing about those improvements?

They are told that they will have seven or eight minutes to discuss, though generally ten minutes is allotted. Ten minutes puts pressure on the group to deal with the task, yet allows enough time for each member to contribute. When large amounts of time were used, more individualistic issues were raised accompanied by greater dissension.

The facilitator lets the students know that after the discussions, the class will reconvene and each group will report. These reports will be written on the board or overhead, and recorded. It is explained that what is written on the board will be taken as representing the overall class and taken back to the instructor.

The students are then asked to form groups and begin. After five or six minutes, the facilitator should prod the groups on by indicating how much time remains. After the allotted time, the class is reconvened and the facilitator may select one or two students to keep notes on what is about to be written on the board. Group reports are then taken. Initially,

we would have each spokesperson report all their responses to a particular question, but this often left little for other groups to add since the responses are often homogenous. To avoid leaving groups out, and the feeling that their efforts were for naught, each spokesperson is asked to only give one response. As many groups as are possible are tapped, in smaller classes it is possible to have the groups report two or three times per question. After the likes are enumerated and written on the board, the improvements are taken and the suggestions.

Though the small group discussions help to filter out minority views, those views are still sometimes reported. The facilitator must be sensitive to dissension and minority reporting. When it is obvious that a view is not shared by most, asking for a show of hands of supportors and non-supportors provides rough percentages of the class stand. These percentages are also indicated on the board. Nominal group technique suggests saving discussion of issues until after all the reports have been taken. When dissension first occurs, we suggest assuring the students that they will have later opportunity to discuss the controversial issues. This delay detaches negative criticism towards the group that presents an unpopular opinion.

The facilitator may wish to summarize the comments on the board to assure accurate understanding.

We have found several problems that can occur in this classroom session. The facilitator may try to impose his/her own views on what the students are saying, reducing the accuracy and the students' trust. Sometimes, facilitators evaluate the students' comments usually increasing students' distrust and skepticism about the process. Sometimes, the student discussion can become very vocal and the facilitator needs to be

skilled in handling conflict situations. Another problem identified has been the lack of sensitivity of some facilitators. Minority views are falsely reported to the instructor as representative of the entire class.

Step Three: The next step in SGID is the feedback session between the facilitator and the instructor. This step has been identified as the most difficult part of the process. We have identified several interpersonal skills that a facilitator needs, specifically: supportive, warm, sensitive, understanding, non-judgmental, and an active listener. Besides these skills, the facilitator should have adequate teaching experience and knowledge.

At one demonstration, an observer questioned the efficacy of facilitators providing interpretation of student motivations. This point lead to a taxonomy of facilitator roles. The first level a facilitator operates from is that of a communication channel with primary concern for conveying the students' sentiments in such a way as to avoid defensive reactions from the instructor that may block the flow of information.

The second level is that of information source. The facilitator may wish to share his or her own teaching experiences and/or inform the instructor of available resources or techniques.

At the third level, which should only be incorporated by more experienced facilitators, possible interpretations of student reasoning and concerns are given. The facilitator may offer hypothesized explanations of the instructor's teaching strategies for instructor reaction and reflection. In this session, the facilitator and instructor discuss the instructor's reaction to the students' comments and plan a strategy of change. They should also discuss what the instructor should say to the students.

Step Four: In the next step, the instructor reviews with the class. The instructor should use the first ten minutes in the ensuing class period to get clarification from students about comments that were unclear, summarize the students comments to allow them to correct distortions and check for accuracy, and finally the instructor should provide some reaction to the comments which might include outlining any intended changes or adaptations.

Step Five: The final step involves a follow-up session between the facilitator and the instructor. Because many of our demonstrations occurred off-campus, this step was often not performed, and consequently it is not as well developed as the others. This session should be used to review with the instructor the success of the review session with the students. The session should emphasize a self-evaluation by the instructor of how the changes are working, as well as an analysis of impact upon the students. This session should serve to reinforce the instructor's changes and improvements.

Now that we've reviewed the process and the most effective methods which we have developed through the grant, we will outline the development of materials and the specific dissemination that has occurred.

One point that should be made initially is that over the two years of the grant there have been three workshop coordinators, and two office assistants. This turnover has caused some problems in continuity and has somewhat undermined the full potential of the program. The major personnel change occurred at the end of the first year, and thus did not significantly disrupt the program during the school year.

The change in personnel was paralleled by a change in approaches to the technique, the development of materials, and dissemination procedures.

Despite these changes, the grant exceeded the proposed objectives attesting to the strength of the technique.

Material preparation consisted of printed handouts and the development of two videotape programs. The printed material was re-written twice -- each time reflecting modifications that had been made to the technique. The materials developed the first year included: 1) a general description of SGID; 2) a description of the facilitator's role; 3) a description of the instructor feedback session; 4) a discussion of SGIDing by yourself; 5) questions often asked by students and instructors; and 6) writing an instructional improvement contract. Besides these informational sheets several questionnaire forms were developed the first year for evaluation purposes.

During the second year, the above informational packet was re-written and expanded. An attempt was made to make the packet self-sufficient; that is, an interested faculty member would find enough information in the handouts to act as a facilitator for others (see Appendix A). Added to the previous packet were: 1) a sample feedback sheet; 2) a comprehensive outline of the facilitator steps; and 3) a sample data sheet for use in the initial instructor-facilitator interview. The packet was mailed to over 250 instructional centers throughout the country in February 1981. An additional 400 copies have been distributed to faculty at conventions, workshops and demonstrations.

In the fall of 1980, a pamphlet was prepared that briefly described the technique and its advantages (see Appendix B). This pamphlet was included in the instructional center mailing, and other mailings. In addition, the pamphlet was distributed at four national conventions. Almost 500 of these brochures have been disseminated.

A videotape that included a demonstration of SGID along with testimonies from previous faculty participants was begun at the end of the first year (September 1980). Technical and editing problems delayed the final tape until the spring of 1981. That tape was incorporated in the workshops conducted after that time. The tape was mailed to fifteen institutions for duplication.

In May 1981, work began on a training videotape. This tape includes an outline of the specific steps to be followed by a facilitator, plus examples of problems that might be encountered. This tape was completed by the end of July 1981 and is being distributed for duplication. Both of the videotapes and the handout materials will continue to be disseminated after the grant ends.

One of the major successes under the grant has been the number of classes in which the technique has been demonstrated, and the number of faculty exposed to the technique in workshops. (The impact and evaluations of these demonstrations and workshops were analyzed through the Educational Assessment Center (EAC) of the University of Washington in the spring of 1981. The complete report is attached as Appendix C, but the overview is discussed in the next section -- "Outcomes and Impacts.")

The technique has been conducted through the grant in over one hundred and thirty classes with a total enrollment of approximately ten thousand students. These courses included almost every discipline and type of classroom situation. Among the courses were metal shop, landscape architecture studios, developmental English, large introductory science lecture courses, and graduate seminars, as well as the more standard lecture/discussion class of 25 to 40 students. The course ranged in enrollments from six students to four hundred. The technique seemed to have

the greatest usage for the larger class where direct feedback to the instructor is limited (see "Outcomes and Impacts").

In addition, we estimate that the technique has been conducted by other faculty across the country in at least fifty classes. Since a majority of our workshops were only conducted this last spring (1981), many institutions have not had an opportunity to implement the technique. Over twenty institutions will have established a formal structure for providing SGID to interested faculty by this Fall (1981).

Workshops followed a basic pattern, with some adaptation to the needs of the sponsoring institution. Generally, two to four classes were obtained as demonstrations of the technique, to which interested faculty were invited to observe. Feedback sessions with the instructors were also open to observers. The last part of a workshop consisted of a presentation to faculty and a discussion of the demonstrations. Overhead materials were prepared for these sessions which included general information about course evaluation and specific information about SGID.

During the first year, workshops and demonstrations were conducted at the institutions. These were primarily institutions in Washington, and in northern California. Additional demonstrations were conducted at a state psychology forum, and for the Higher Education Renewal Organization Northwest.

During the second year, workshops and demonstrations were conducted at twenty-six universities and colleges. Several invitations had to be turned down because of budget restraints. An attempt was made to cover most regions of the country, and to choose institutions with affiliations with regional educational networks. Over three hundred faculty attended those workshops.

During the second year, a demonstration was also conducted at the National Conference of the Professional and Organization Development Network (POD) in higher education.

During the first year, questionnaires were used after several class interventions to assess student response to SGID compared to other techniques. Out of a class of 186 students who completed a course-end evaluation of the technique, approximately 4 out of 5 answered "yes" to the question, "Did you find the class evaluation with the consultant useful?". In another course, 49 of the 50 students thought the SGID experience was useful. In a course of 52 students, SGID was rated the most important means of obtaining feedback when compared to four other methods that were used. Additional data was collected about the students perception of improvement in the areas they identified. Over 80% of the items were seen as having at least improved somewhat.

During the second year, a more comprehensive effort was focused on the question of the impact of SGID on improving teaching and learning. Since SGID claims to provide useful information and suggestions to faculty in order to improve instruction, some impact should be identifiable in students' learning behavior. Previous research had difficulty assessing student learning without the use of some comprehensive/standardized end-of-term exam, which is a questionable measure of learning. This study attempted to avoid the assessment of student learning by examining the more distinguishable but interrelated construct of student motivation. After a review of the literature and interviews with several experienced teachers, a self-report instrument was constructed that attempted to get at behavioral, attitudinal, and perceptual components of student motivation (see Appendix D). In a course of over 400 students, the student motivation questionnaire was

administered at midterm to all students. SGID was then performed in half of the lab sections. At the end of the term, all the students again filled out the motivation questionnaire. In this exploratory study, six of the eighteen items were significantly improved ($p < .15$) for the SGID participants. None of the items changed in a positive significant direction for non-SGID participants, and actually 13 items were in the negative direction for the non-SGID participants. This result indicates that is not just having the instructor making a change that impacts student motivation, but rather the interaction between student participation and instructor acknowledgment and change.

Another study, with greater controls, was conducted using two large introductory courses. In both courses, the students filled out the motivation questionnaire at midterm but only one class participated in SGID. At the end of the quarter, both classes again completed the motivation questionnaire. Ten of the eighteen items showed significant improvement ($p < .05$) in motivation levels for the SGID participants; none for the non-SGID group. On a scale composed of all eighteen items, the SGID group improved significantly ($p = .005$), but not the control group ($p = .196$, in the opposite direction).

These results provide strong evidence of a positive impact of Small Group Instructional Diagnosis upon the motivation levels of students. The results of the first study were presented to the Seventh International Conference on Improving University Teaching in Tsukuba, Japan. The results of the second study are being submitted for publication.

E. Outcomes and Impacts

Any project that deals with the improvement of instruction has the potential of effecting an almost infinite number of students because of the

exponential impact. For example, though the technique may only be directly conducted with a class of fifty students, any change the instructor makes in teaching strategy may be carried over to other courses and from year to year thus affecting all of the students that instructor teaches. There is also the impact of the technique being conducted by more and more faculty, and at more and more institutions from year to year. We are excited by reports we have received of institutions we have visited introducing the technique to regional educational facilities. We cannot give any accurate assessment of the growth since many of our workshops were just completed.

The combined enrollments of the universities where workshops were conducted was approximately 450,000 students. This figure represents a very real and immediate populace that will feel the impact of the technique as it takes hold, Those schools also represent a combined teaching faculty of approximately 30,000 members. Though during the grant only about 1/2 of 1% were directly involved, a very real potential exists to effect the rest of the faculty.

During the first year of the grant, questionnaires were administered immediately following several of the workshops. The workshops successfully met their objectives and SGID was seen as more useful than other feedback/evaluation methods. All the participants expressed some inclination to use the technique with the responses falling between "might use in future" to "try as soon as possible" on an interval scale.

The second year, the questionnaire was not used after each workshop, but rather a questionnaire was distributed at the end of spring 1981 by the Educational Assessment Center. That questionnaire was sent to those who had volunteered their classes for demonstrations, and to the individuals who had arranged and coordinated the workshops over the two years. The

questionnaire was mailed at a time when several of the schools had already ended for the summer. As a result, only thirteen out of thirty-three of the coordinators receiving questionnaires returned them. Sixty-nine of at least one hundred and fifty instructors returned the questionnaires directed to them. The complete evaluation can be found in Appendices C, 1, 2, and 3. The following is the conclusion reached by the Educational Assessment Center:

> Based on the responses of those coordinators who did complete questionnaires, the workshops and demonstrations were of high quality and were very effective in demonstrating SGID. Furthermore, it appears the SGID will be a permanent instructional improvement service provided on each of the campuses, in addition to those services already provided. However, because many of the workshops were held within the last several months, a definitive answer on the continuance of usage of the technique on these campuses must await the passage of more time.
>
> Similarly, while most faculty who responded have only used the technique once, the majority also plan to use it again; in fact, some plan to use it every time they teach. Again, only time will tell, but there is no reason at this point to be pessimistic. Clearly the overall tone of the respondents, both coordinators and faculty, was much more positive than negative in their reaction to and appreciation of SGID.
>
> The most frequently reported advantage of SGID was its timing. Specifically respondents saw a great advantage in receiving results early enough in a course to make immediate adjustments. Also prominent was mention of the reactions of students to having participated in SGID. Faculty saw increased motivation and responsibility in students and greater rapport and interaction between themselves and students. Coordinators also saw the direct interaction with students inherent in the technique as a major advantage. Of course, faculty who feel that students should not play a major role in the planning and structuring of a course would not necessarily view SGID's involving of students as a positive feature.
>
> There appears to be two factors which stand in the way of SGID being adopted as the prominent mode of teaching evaluations on campus. First, individual student responses tend to be blurred in favor of group consensus. Relatedly, there is no easy way to communicate results to the administration for support of personnel decisions. Perhaps this is an advantage, or, if not, perhaps supplementary data could be collected in the context of SGID which would fulfill that role. Secondly, SGID depends upon the availability of an effective facilitator. Faculty responses indicated a willingness in the majority of cases to perform that duty; however, about 30 percent of those willing feel the need

for more training before embarkation. Clearly, coordination between faculty wishing evaluation and potential facilitators will be required, particularly as some faculty will prefer a coordinator from outside of their own department.

On most campuses, the major technique whereby evaluative information about teaching is collected from students is end-of-course student ratings. In comparing the results of SGID with student ratings, both coordinators and faculty saw some clear advantage to the former. Most impressive, perhaps, was faculty ratings of the amount and direction of change in their teaching and classes given to SGID and to student ratings. For each of ten factors, e.g., student motivation, SGID received a higher positive average than student ratings. Seven of the ten differences were statistically significant.

From the data provided by the questionnaires, one would have to conclude that the SGID workshops and demonstrations were successful and that the SGID technique will become a major mode for facilitating instructional improvement. A follow-up questionnaire, perhaps sent out one year from now, could provide a more definitive picture of the longer term impacts of dissemination efforts and of the future of SGID on the nation's campuses.

The evaluation was conducted by an outside/objective source. We are confident in the results they have reported, and have found the results concurring with our own subjective analysis. Ideally, this evaluation should be followed up in a year's time to assess the true impact of the grant since, as mentioned, many institutions are just beginning to implement SGID.

The evaluation also provided information in an area which concerned us, why instructors had not used the technique again. The results provide direction for future efforts to maintain faculty involvement. One response that was disturbing dealt with the perception that SGID need only be used when a faculty member feels there is some difficulty occurring in the course. Also, faculty reported that they thought it was valuable only as an occasional tool. Both points seem to reflect an attitude that focuses on SGID only in terms of what it provides the instructor without considering the impact on the students. This attitude may be merely reflecting the fact that the overall faculty volunteers who participated represents the better

instructors, and actually had less suggestions for improvement than might ordinarily be expected.

Overall, we feel quite proud of what we accomplished, and that the overall evaluations showed such strong support and success.

AUG 13 1982

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024